



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,921	09/20/2005	Detlef Renner	038741.55725US	6640
23911 7590 09/03/2009 CROWELL & MORING LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP P.O. BOX 14300 WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300				
EXAMINER				
TAOUSAKIS, ALEXANDER P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3726				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/03/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/522,921

Applicant(s)

RENNER, DETLEF

Examiner

ALEXANDER P. TAOUSAKIS

Art Unit

3726

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foster (6,311,704) in view of Ootoshi et al (6,609,878).

Claim 1:

Foster teaches a method for maintenance of gas turbines (*see column 9 lines 3-8, where it discloses that the device may be used on all types of turbines*), including attaching a cleaning apparatus (*see Figure 1*) to the gas turbine and injecting foamed chemicals into existing portions (*see Figures 1 and column 5 lines 40-55*).

Foster fails to teach removing the gas turbine from the cleaning apparatus and thereafter passing the turbine off for disassembly.

Ootoshi et al teaches a method for maintenance of turbines, wherein a turbine is transported from different stations within a building to be disassembled, inspected, and reassembled (*see column 7 lines 26-41, where it discloses the transporting device, column 3 lines 23-44, where it discloses a disassembly device and inspecting of the gas turbine engine components*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transport, disassemble and inspect the gas turbine of Foster, as taught by Ootoshi et al, because it ensures proper operation of the turbine assembly and it minimizes deterioration of parts. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to perform the cleaning operation prior to the disassembly and inspection operations because it makes it easier to disassembly and the cleaner turbine surfaces allows for a more accurate and complete inspection.

Claim 2: Foster/Ootoshi et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein the gas turbine is cleaned all over (*see Foster column 3 lines 8-32, where it disclose that the cleaning apparatus will be attached to existing ports of the turbine engine and will clean the entire turbine assembly*).

Claim 3: Foster/Ootoshi et al teach the method of claim 1, but fail to teach draining liquids from the gas turbine prior to cleaning.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to drain hazardous liquids, such as engine oil from the gas turbine engine of Foster because it will ensure the liquids are collected and do not contaminate its surroundings.

Claims 4-5: Foster/Ootoshi et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein the gas turbine is moved to disassembly with a feed device (21), the feed device being a crane (*see Ootoshi et al Figure 11 and column 7 lines 26-41*).

Claim 6: Foster/Ootoshi et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein the gas turbine is positioned on a second feed device (*see Ootoshi et al Figure 11, which shows a second feed device 21*).

Claims 7-8: Foster/Ootoshi et al teach the method of claim 6, wherein the gas turbine is moved through workstation arranged in succession by the second feed device (*see Figure 11 and column 11 lines 20-28, where it discloses the turbine moved through multiple disassembly stations*).

Claim 9. Foster/Ootoshi et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein after being disassembled, at least one of the individual parts are inspected and then the turbine is then reassembled (*see Ootoshi et al column 11 lines 20-41*).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 05/27/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Foster fails to teach or suggest introducing a gas turbine into a first apparatus. This is not found persuasive because the gas turbine of Foster is introduced into the cleaning apparatus (10) by being introduced into the housing outlet (24) and within the walls dictated by the fasteners (34) (*see Figure 2*). Also note that the claim does not require that the apparatus be larger than the turbine, or that the apparatus covers a portion of the turbine, just that the turbine is introduced into the apparatus.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALEXANDER P. TAOUSAKIS whose telephone number is (571)272-3497. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bryant can be reached on (571) 272-4526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alexander P Taousakis
Examiner
Art Unit 3726

/Alexander P Taousakis/
Examiner, Art Unit 3726

/DAVID P. BRYANT/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3726